

A CHAPTER ON POLITICS.

Ex-Gov. Foster, of Ohio, Interviewed On Presidential Possibilities and Party Issues.

The Coming Fight to Be Made On the Tariff Question and the Criminal Hated Lincoln.

The Louisiana Republicans Indorse Arthur's Administration But Send Their Delegates Uninstructed.

The National Union League Branch of the Republican Party Organize for the Coming Campaign.

MINOR POLITICAL MATTERS.

Special to the Courier-Journal.

NEW YORK, March 6.—Gov. Foster, who has just come from Washington, no longer conceals his preference for Senator Sherman for the Republican nomination. It may be remembered that the construction put upon his former utterances in these dispatches, when he declared that Arthur would carry Ohio, was that Senator Sherman and he had buried the past, and that he would soon make open declaration to that effect. That statement, however, he says the Ohio delegation will probably go to the Chicago Convention unprompted; that the convention will be remarkably a deliberative body, and that Mr. Sherman is not and will not be an avowed candidate. He thinks that Southern outcries will occupy more attention in the campaign than any other issue.

This conclusion will be recognized as tallying with Mr. Sherman's utterances in Congress.

"What about Arthur?" he was asked.

"Arthur has done well, but no man who has held the Presidency by reason of his election as Vice-President has ever yet been nominated after filling the office to which he was not originally chosen by the people."

"Are any names mentioned in Ohio in reference to the Vice-Presidency?"

"Our people have absolutely no choice at the present time, and they are simply awaiting developments."

"Your name has frequently been mentioned in connection with the second place on the ticket."

"I am not a candidate for any office. I have no interests whatever in the coming contest, except those of any other citizen."

"Is Gen. Sherman's name spoken of as a Presidential candidate?"

"He has been, but it is understood that he would not accept a nomination."

"Will the liquor question play a prominent part in Ohio politics this year?"

"Yes. The Republican vote was greatly diminished last year on that account. Last year the wool question also had some effect and proved very injurious to the Republicans, and the Democrats are now making it a point to bring it up again."

"Upon what issue will the campaign be fought?"

"Upon the Southern question—that is, the Danville riots and the Colfax county outrages. At the conference of the public in Columbus the other night, just prior to the meeting of the Republican State Committee, that subject was fully discussed."

"Who is the Democratic candidate mentioned as the leader on the other side?"

"Generally, Ohio Democrats favor Payne. His elements of strength and elements of weakness, as he is a very respectable man, but somewhat advanced in years. I have no doubt, though, that he is perfectly sincere in his declaration that he will not run for a second term."

"How is the old ticket?"

"Satisfactory. The people in Ohio don't know who he is."

"How does Flower stand?"

"He is not known. The people in Ohio don't know who he is."

"In conclusion, the Governor said: 'The tariff will be the great question, that is, unless the Democrats drop it, and if they attempt to do so it will be pressed on them. In Ohio the liquor question will again play a very important part. In the last campaign the liquor element spent about \$200,000 in the campaign, and were very active and energetic, and the Democrats are now unable to repeat the feat.'

LOUISIANA REPUBLICANS COMPLETE THEIR WORK AND ADJOURN, INDORSING ARTHUR'S ADMINISTRATION, BUT REFUSING TO INSTRUCT FOR HIM.

(Special to the Courier-Journal.)

NEW ORLEANS, March 6.—The Republican State Convention finished its labors to-night and adjourned. It was controlled throughout by the master hand of Congressman Kellogg, and the majority endorsed his will not only in the selection of delegates to the national convention, but in the nomination of a State ticket. It was doubtful, until he interfered, if a State ticket would be nominated, but upon taking his seat, Governor Foster, who had been declared that in his opinion the best interests of the party demanded that a State ticket should be nominated, and the question was settled, notwithstanding the earnest protests of many of the negro leaders from North Louisiana and the Red river, some of whom withdrew from the convention when the question was decided against them.

These held that the nomination of a State ticket would disturb the harmony existing between the whites and blacks in the country, where the candidates for parish offices have been selected from both parties.

The State ticket finally selected is composed of good material, but is essentially weak from a political standpoint. None of the candidates are leading men in the party and have no political following.

Mr. John C. Stevenson, the head of the ticket, is a wealthy sugar planter, and was not nominated with the hope that he would draw some Democratic votes from the sugar district of the State.

Judge W. M. Burwell, candidate for Lieutenant Governor, is an old member of the New Orleans press, Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, and an authority upon economic questions.

The rest of the ticket are small politicians, with the exception of the candidate for Attorney General, John H. Stone. This gentleman is a Democrat, and was a candidate before the recent Democratic convention for the position of Auditor. It is not believed that he will accept the nomination.

The candidates for Secretary of State and Auditor are colored men.

The delegates selected by the districts to go to the National Convention are as follows: First District—W. B. Merchant and R. F. Smith; Second District—P. F. Herwig, of Orleans, and Henry Demas, of St. Johns; Third District—G. D. Drury, of Assumption; L. A. Marquette, of St. Martin; Alternates—A. D. Davis, of Iberville; J. A. Farish; Thomas A. Cane, of Terrebonne.

Fourth District—A. H. Leonard and Wm. Harper, of Cadejo; Alternates—W. H. Peck and A. J. Smith, of Iberville; J. A. Farish; Thomas A. Cane, of Terrebonne.

Fifth District—Frank K. Mercey, ex-Congressman, of Madison, and E. W. Wall, of Concordia; Alternates—John V. Cooke, of West Carroll, and E. O. Neal, of Thibodaux.

Sixth District—L. J. Souer, of Avoyelles.

The delegates to the National Convention are as follows: First District—W. B. Merchant and R. F. Smith; Second District—P. F. Herwig, of Orleans, and Henry Demas, of St. Johns; Third District—G. D. Drury, of Assumption; L. A. Marquette, of St. Martin; Alternates—A. D. Davis, of Iberville; J. A. Farish; Thomas A. Cane, of Terrebonne.

Fourth District—A. H. Leonard and Wm. Harper, of Cadejo; Alternates—W. H. Peck and A. J. Smith, of Iberville; J. A. Farish; Thomas A. Cane, of Terrebonne.

Fifth District—Frank K. Mercey, ex-Congressman, of Madison, and E. W. Wall, of Concordia; Alternates—John V. Cooke, of West Carroll, and E. O. Neal, of Thibodaux.

Sixth District—L. J. Souer, of Avoyelles.

The delegates to the National Convention are as follows: First District—W. B. Merchant and R. F. Smith; Second District—P. F. Herwig, of Orleans, and Henry Demas, of St. Johns; Third District—G. D. Drury, of Assumption; L. A. Marquette, of St. Martin; Alternates—A. D. Davis, of Iberville; J. A. Farish; Thomas A. Cane, of Terrebonne.

Fourth District—A. H. Leonard and Wm. Harper, of Cadejo; Alternates—W. H. Peck and A. J. Smith, of Iberville; J. A. Farish; Thomas A. Cane, of Terrebonne.

Fifth District—Frank K. Mercey, ex-Congressman, of Madison, and E. W. Wall, of Concordia; Alternates—John V. Cooke, of West Carroll, and E. O. Neal, of Thibodaux.

Sixth District—L. J. Souer, of Avoyelles.

The delegates to the National Convention are as follows: First District—W. B. Merchant and R. F. Smith; Second District—P. F. Herwig, of Orleans, and Henry Demas, of St. Johns; Third District—G. D. Drury, of Assumption; L. A. Marquette, of St. Martin; Alternates—A. D. Davis, of Iberville; J. A. Farish; Thomas A. Cane, of Terrebonne.

Fourth District—A. H. Leonard and Wm. Harper, of Cadejo; Alternates—W. H. Peck and A. J. Smith, of Iberville; J. A. Farish; Thomas A. Cane, of Terrebonne.

Fifth District—Frank K. Mercey, ex-Congressman, of Madison, and E. W. Wall, of Concordia; Alternates—John V. Cooke, of West Carroll, and E. O. Neal, of Thibodaux.

Sixth District—L. J. Souer, of Avoyelles.

and Clifford Morgan, of Point Coupee; Alternates—H. V. Baranco and Oscar Holt. It is understood that the investigation throughout, Drury is Collector of Internal Revenue; Martins, Assistant Surveyor of the Port; Leonard, United States District Attorney; Harlan, an attorney of the District Court; Souer, United States Appraiser.

The delegates are equally divided between whites and blacks, eight of each, including the four at large.

A strong effort was made to have the convention endorse Arthur, but it failed. An attempt was made to elect a platform committee, with a little result. The leaders were opposed to showing their hands, and had the resolutions referred to the Committee on Resolutions, of which Collector Rodgers was Chairman. This committee ignored both resolutions, but reported one strongly indorsing Arthur's administration, which was adopted with a yeas.

It is understood that Kellogg was opposed to instructions, as he desired to manipulate the election, and to have the convention endorse his administration.

There was a strong minority in favor of Logan, but the office-holders were too numerous for them.

It was also proposed to have a Kellogg delegation, with one or two exceptions, and that Arthur will get the votes on the first ballot; where they will go afterward only the astute manipulators who handle them know. It is safe to say that if Kellogg is earnestly for Arthur, the President triumphantly opens his campaign with the nomination with sixteen votes at his back.

THE NATIONAL UNION LEAGUE MEETS AT WASHINGTON AND ORGANIZES FOR WORK IN THE COMING PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

WASHINGTON, March 6.—The National Council of the National Union League held its annual session in this city to-day. Hon. James S. Negley, of Pittsburgh, presided, and Thomas G. Baker, of New York, acted as Secretary.

The first order of business was the election of a committee to prepare a platform for the coming Presidential campaign, the consideration of the anti-Bourbon movement in the Southern States, its necessities, and the means to be employed to assist the independents in that section.

The following were elected officers for the coming year: President, James S. Negley; Vice-President, Wm. F. Chandler, New Hampshire; Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, Ohio; Col. J. B. Bryant, Georgia; J. E. O'Hara, North Carolina; Col. Thos. R. Rich, Maryland; C. F. Scott, West Virginia; A. A. Boutelle, Maine; L. C. Houk, Tennessee; S. A. McAllister, Delaware, and B. K. Bruce, Mississippi; Corresponding Secretary, Thos. G. Baker, New York; Assistant Corresponding Secretary, J. W. Bartlett, Massachusetts; Recording Secretary, R. V. Gwynne, Pennsylvania; Treasurer, R. M. Clapp, Washington, D. C.; Chaplain, Capt. J. J. Cooper, Pennsylvania; Marshal, Geo. Simpson, Sergeant-at-Arms, S. T. Damar, Pennsylvania.

The Committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs reported a report describing the condition of affairs politically in the Southern States, and suggesting plans for adoption by the League to aid in securing freedom of ballot to all citizens.

Representative Matthews and Houk, of Tennessee, addressed the council in support of the recommendations made by the committee, that aid be extended to the opponents of John B. Scales.

They presented statistics of the anti-Bourbon vote in Tennessee, showing it had increased from less than 100,000 in the Presidential election of 1880 to 80,000 in the Garfield election and to 105,000 in the last gubernatorial election. They stated that an additional 10,000 votes would be secured by the League, and that these votes could be brought out if assistance were given to overcome the lawlessness which operated in that State against the free exercise of political rights.

Addresses on the same subject were made by Representative Boutelle, of Maine; Gen. Charles H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

A special committee, to be known as the Committee on Bourbons, was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

The committee on Bourbons and Miscellaneous Affairs was then appointed as follows: Gen. C. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; Thos. R. Rich, of Maryland; J. E. O'Hara, of North Carolina; and J. B. Bryant, of Georgia.

informal ballot, each member being requested to express the preference for the Chairman of the County Committee. Many said they would not be bound by the action of the caucus.

It may be recalled that the informal ballot was: O'Brien, 119; Marvella W. Cooker, 14; William Dowd, 3; G. B. Dean, 2.

Col. Spencer moved that O'Brien be declared the nominee of the County Committee. Violent speeches were made in opposition to O'Brien. The motion was finally carried with an aye which shook the building. About a dozen voted "no." The meeting then adjourned, but not before hostilely used withdrawal from the room after entering a protest against the proceedings.

RESIGNED.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., March 6.—Chairman McKelvey has retired from the Democratic State Committee, being a candidate for the nomination for Governor before the State convention.

THE ILLINOIS DEMOCRATS.

PEORIA, ILL., March 6.—The Democratic State Convention closed its session to-day. Peoria was the place of holding the State Convention, and the date was fixed for July 2.

THE MAINE DEMOCRATS.

BANGOR, ME., March 6.—The Democratic State Convention meets June 17, in this city.

FELLOWPLAY'S FAST TIME.

He lowers the Record at New Orleans, Beat his Own Time and that of the track.

(Special to the Courier-Journal.)

NEW ORLEANS, March 6.—The largest crowd of the meeting, the best racing and very fast time were the features of to-day's sport.

The first race, mile dash, was very closely contested, not more than a neck separating Back Jack, Beaufield, Queen Esther and Brooklyn. On that order they came in. Back Jack was considerably in the rear going down the back stretch, but he made a fine burst on the home stretch. The other starters were Voltaire, Lillie Dale, P. Line and Glenbar. The last named was left at the post. Time, 1:45.

Pools—Black Jack, \$25; Campanini, \$18; Voltaire and Glenbar, \$13 each; field, \$15.

Bonnie Australian led from the start to the finish in the next race, the only horse getting a near win being Sullivan, who was beaten a length. Slocum five lengths further back, Harry Mann, Polonia, Capt. Curry and Rex being unplaced. Time, 1:45.

Pools—Sullivan, \$30; Australian, \$20; field, \$15.

The next event, one mile and one-sixteenth, was the fastest race ever run over the track, and resulted in a head victory for Fellowplay. Prince leading, followed by five long lengths. Princess, a unit about two lengths from the string, when Fellowplay put on full steam and just nipped her in the last few jumps. Time, 1:49.

Pools—Fellowplay, \$50; Princess, \$35; Brunswick, \$20.

In the one mile and one-quarter, Buttercup led for a mile, Fairmont a close second. Wave O'Light then moved up and took the lead on the home stretch, winning by half a length from Buttercup. Fairmont eight lengths away, and Ervase still further back. Time, 2:10.

Pools—Buttercup, \$50; Wave O'Light and Fairmont, \$25 each; Ervase, \$10.

A Young Girl Outraged.

MARSHALL, OHIO, March 6.—Sarah Stark, aged 14 years, to-day applied for the arrest of Ed Farmer, R. Seigner, Chas. Fogle and Chas. Riter for rape. She alleges that while going home last night from a cigar factory, where she is employed, Farmer layd her in a lonely spot and forced her to accompany him to a wagonshed, where he ravished her. The other men assisted him, and drove Farmer away, and each in turn twice ravished her and then escaped. Farmer was arrested this morning and put under \$300 bond for hearing this afternoon, but after he was released from custody on bail filed. The Mayor offers a reward for his capture.

A Fight With Hard Gloves.

NEW YORK, March 6.—Four hundred persons, including leading sporting men and prominent politicians, at 3 o'clock this morning witnessed a hard glove fight at a well-known resort on Coney Island, between "Billy" Gracey, of Greenpoint, and Jack Dempsey, of New York. The fight was for the championship of the world, \$400 stakes and the game money. Gracey is 23 years old, well built and weighs 145 pounds. Dempsey weighs 135 pounds and is 35 years old. The men were very evenly matched and punished each other severely. Gracey threw up the sponge in the ninth round.

Teaching Him How to Vote.

(Special to the Courier-Journal.)

ATLANTA, GA., March 6.—In a recent municipal election Capt. Mercer, a prominent sporting man, took a leading part. In a Council meeting, Mr. Kutz, whose election Mercer had aided, voted against the nominee of the latter for Police Commissioner. Mercer to-day invited Connellman Kutz into his place of business, where he belabored him unmercifully, binging up his eyes, and then turned him out on the streets. Kutz is a member of the firm of Regenstein & Kutz, New York and Atlanta.

A Crime Revealed.

SAVANNAH, GA., March 6.—The coroner stopped a negro funeral services and, removing the shroud and clothing of the corpse, revealed nine knife wounds inflicted by the man in whose house the funeral was being held. The victim is Wm. Dunn and the murderer Jerry Hagins, who tried to conceal the murder, reporting pneumonia had taken him.

The Campbell Case.

(Special to the Courier-Journal.)

LEXINGTON, March 6.—The body of Campbell, who was killed here in a saloon last Saturday night, was to-day exhumed, and the ball found in his body. The coroner's jury has been sitting on the case ever since Saturday, and the verdict is through.

The new City Council was to-night sworn in.

A Maine Railroad Accident.

BANGOR, ME., March 6.—A train on the Maine Central railroad met with an accident at South Orrington this morning. Several freight and the baggage and mail cars were wrecked. Baggage-master Cole and Engineer Kennedy were badly hurt and others slightly.

Murder in the First Degree.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., March 6.—Mickey Smith, a policeman, who killed John Monahan last August because the latter resisted Smith when he attempted to arrest him, was found guilty of murder in the first degree. An application will be made for a new trial.

Some One Was Hit.

TRIO, N. Y., March

Courier-Journal.

FRIDAY MORNING, MARCH 7, 1884.

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

Persons mailing transient copies of the Courier-Journal, to friends abroad must place two-cent stamps on all of our right column editions, and three-cent stamps on all double numbers, or they will be detained in the Louisville post-office.

"BUSINESS."

Thursday, March 6.—The breadstuff markets were weak and mostly lower. The movement continues small, though there was a slight increase in exports. Provisions were tame, and prices were not fully supported. Cotton was quiet, and futures in New York ruled a trifle lower. The live stock markets were quiet, and inclined to weakness. The New York Coffee Exchange continues in buyers' favor, sugars being about steady.

In New York, money was easy. Foreign exchange was higher. Government bonds were steady. The stock market was weak and slightly lower.

The Bank of England and the Bank of France report further material additions to their stocks of specie and bullion. In London, the market for American railroads was rather weak. Liverpool produce markets were without important changes.

TURNPIKES AND TOLL-GATES.

Access to a city, direct and inexpensive, is essential to its growth, and continued prosperity. All roads should from the surrounding territory lead to Louisville, and care should be taken to keep the toll-gates as far from the city as possible.

Some years ago a turnpike company was organized to build a road beginning at the end of Fourth street and running south to Cox's knobs. The plan was to make this something of a boulevard or drive, one hundred feet wide. Unfortunately this plan was abandoned, and now it is proposed to consolidate two old turnpike charters, the Jefferson and Bullitt and the National, to be known as the New National. This line, on many accounts, is not so desirable as the Fourth-street route, but a road in that direction is a necessity, and this is better than none.

But we trust the Representatives from the city and the county in the Legislature will insist on two important amendments to the act of consolidation.

The first amendment should require the completion of at least three miles of road beginning at the city limits within two years. One year would be better, but two years is ample time, and if the gentlemen who have the charters are really in earnest they can object to this condition. Charters which are not to be used ought not to be granted. These sleeping charters make mischief at the most unexpected times, as we all remember in connection with the Short-route.

The other amendment provides that the toll-gate nearest the city shall not be placed farther north than a mile and a half from the city limits. It is to the interest of the city to have these gates as far away as possible. The limits of the city are constantly extending, and already thousands of dollars have been expended in buying turnpikes that reached into the city.

One and a half miles from the city limits are 260 acres of ground, a park in embryo, called by its owners "Highland Park," on which \$15,000 have been expended in trees, a conservatory and other improvements. This park is open without cost to the public. It is private property and may be closed at any time, but now it is free and will most likely so remain for some years. No toll-gate ought to be placed between that piece of ground and the city. The owners admit the people free of charge, and the Legislature ought not to give any corporation the right to obstruct the roads to it with toll-gates. Our representatives must be vigilant and see that the two amendments mentioned are made a part of the act of consolidation.

AN ORACLE OF DOUBTFUL RESPONSES.

The three legal-tender decisions of the Supreme Court furnish probably the most forcible illustration ever witnessed in a civilized government in modern times of the elasticity or instability of the highest judicial criteria of interpretation. With convenient facility the same court, adjusting the same case, construing the same law and professing to enforce the same constitutional canon, makes three decrees in the space of fourteen years, each of which is directly antagonistic to either of the others. The lay mind might be excused after witnessing this astonishing spectacle for suspecting that the legal square and compass in this country are made of wax and the measuring line of gum elastic. A law, may even a constitutional decree, means under such vacillation everything and nothing. What is forbidden to-day by the court of last resort may be the highest rule of action next year, and to effect the revolution of the circle which brings the antipodes of law and principle together the judiciary branch of the Government requires no help from the legislative authority or the will of the people. This has very much the complexion of a regime of judicial usurpation, in which the judiciary have taken upon themselves the power to make and unmake laws, to vacate the functions of the legislative authority and to treat the sanctions of the Constitution with respect, or with contempt, as they may happen to stand related to the business in hand.

This anomalous state of things is not known to have distinguished modern jurisprudence in other civilized countries, and happily for the destinies of free institutions, it is in this country a distinction which can be claimed only by the representatives of one party, which is losing its grasp upon public affairs. The progress of the Supreme Court in this business strikingly exemplifies the political inspirations of the party of centralization. In the first legal-tender adjudication, that of 1870, Democratic justices held the balance of power, and the decision was in strict accordance with the Constitution. In the second adjudication, that of 1871, three Republicans had been added to the bench, and by a majority of one the court decided that the legal-tender clause was admissible under a clause of the Constitution which justified extreme measures only as necessitated by "the exigency of war." In the third decision the court decided that the legal-tender acts of the war were constitutional, and that any future legal-tender acts passed by Congress in time of war or peace will be constitutional, with the whole court voting affirmatively, with the sole

exception of the one Democratic Justice on the bench. The spirit of the Republican party is here seen in bold relief—its impotence of wholesome restraint, its contempt for the venerable script in which the people have written what they considered a permanent law, its hostility to all control and constraint which law places upon political ambitions and party license. This decision is spoken of commonly as a finality, but there is certainly no reason why another artificial case might not be manufactured to order like that of *Junia*, and the decision of last Monday reversed next year—save one. The past exercise of interpretation prove that the law is no barrier to another reversal, but there is a barrier which will doubtless prove sufficient. That is, the Constitution is rendered a dead letter, and the Government is given complete license. There will be no disposition in the court, as it is now composed, either to resurrect the Constitution or to hamper the license of government. Hence this decision will stand.

THE RAILROAD COMMISSION.

Judge BECKER imagines that the *Courier-Journal* has, in its criticism of its report, done the Railroad Commissioners serious injustice. As nothing was further from our purpose, we publish his communication, and any one who will read it and compare it with the report and our articles must conclude that the report contains much of which the Commissioners themselves are ignorant. The only explanation that occurs to us is that some unauthorized individual has interpolated matter in the report without the knowledge of the Commissioners. At any rate, we can clearly show that every statement we have made is according to the record.

As for the interment of the *Railway Age*, that is of little value. The editor has been misled, like Judge BECKER, by a hasty and superficial examination of the report. We have read it not only once, but several times, and each reading exhibits some new cause for protest.

Our charge is that the Commissioners are reaching out for greater power and patronage; that they are asking extraordinary power—power never conferred in this State on Commissioners, and some never conferred at all, and that if the recommendations are adopted by the Legislature the Commission may be made within five years the most powerful political engine in the State. Now for the specifications.

First—They ask for power to regulate, or, as they put it, to supervise rates. We refer to page 70, where they say the English Commission is established "with substantially the powers which are needed in Kentucky." Either the Kentucky Commissioners did not know when this paragraph was written what these powers were, or else they suppose the public and the Legislature would not know. On page 73, referring to the powers possessed by the English Commission, the following are enumerated: "First—Power to approve the working arrangements between railroads, and steam vessels; second, authority to hear and determine complaints, in fact, unusual judicial power, which, under our constitution, could not be delegated to a commission; third, still other judicial powers which are not to be considered with us; fourth, to determine and appropriate the through rates chargeable on freight forwarded over two or more lines—

with us this would amount to regulating rates on interstate commerce, and is out of the question; fifth, to hear and determine questions in dispute as to terminal charges; sixth, to enforce publication of rates."

These powers, according to the Commissioners, "are substantially what we need in Kentucky." In answer, it is only necessary to say that a commission here is out of the question; it is, in fact, a judicial tribunal. Our laws, our customs and the natural conditions make it, as a State Commission, not only undesirable but impracticable, but Judge BECKER sees nothing extraordinary in such a suggestion.

But the charge that they ask power to regulate or supervise rates is still further sustained by reference to page 77. There the Commissioners state definitely what powers they would like to have. The 4th section is as follows:

"To supervise changes in rates so that advantages may not be taken of pressure in transportation to charge exorbitantly and that there may not be resorted to that will unsettle business and injure the corporations engaged."

This, of course, has escaped the view of Judge BECKER, or he would not have said, as he does in his letter to the *Courier-Journal*: "But the commission has asked for no such power," and again, "It nowhere squints at a revision or regulation of rates." It is true the Commissioners in one place do say that the Legislature ought not to adopt "cast-iron rates," but in lieu of this it does not only squint at revision and regulation by a commission, but it explicitly asks that this power be given. It is one thing to revise, supervise or regulate, and another to adopt "cast-iron rates." The whole report is written to strengthen a demand for power by the commission to supervise rates, as the quotations we have made clearly show, and, as settling the whole matter, we quote section nine of the bill submitted by the Commissioners:

"Sec. 9. It shall be the duty of each corporation operating a railroad, or any part thereof, within this State, to submit to said Commissioners any change or changes it may propose to make in rates, passenger or freight, or the classification thereof, or any change or discontinuance of deposit or station, with the reasons therefor, and no such change shall be made or be in effect until approved in writing by a majority of said Commissioners, whose certificate of such approval, signed by the Secretary or Chairman of said board, shall be sufficient evidence thereof."

Second—As still further exemplifying the desire of the Commission for enlarged and extraordinary power, we refer to page seventy-seven, specification two, which asks specifically that the Commission be given power not only to supervise the railroads, but also the telegraph, express and telephone companies.

Third—In still stronger confirmation that the Commission asks for extraordinary power, which, if conferred, would, within five years, make it the most potent political engine in the State, we refer to the twenty-six specifications of power asked on pages seventy-six and seventy-seven—too numerous to mention here—and to one other, objectionable on page fifty. There the Commissioners modestly suggest that the power to incorporate railroads be delegated by the Legislature to the Commission in order to "relieve the General Assembly of much annoyance." Carrying on this suggestion, a bill is drawn and submitted (page 261), which, if adopted, would do much to make the Commission exceedingly dangerous and soon obnoxious.

Fourth—As substantiating our statement that if the suggestions of the Commission

ers were carried out they would have patronage exceeding the combined patronage of the Federal and State Governments in Kentucky, we refer to page 23, under the head "railway employees." Judge BECKER says:

"You are certainly mistaken when you say that the Commission has asked for the right of selecting the officers of the railroad companies. They simply discuss the power of the Legislature to protect the people against disagreeable and incompetent officials with whom the public are obliged to come in contact whilst using the railroads."

This only serves to confirm the impression that Judge BECKER has not read his own report. In one place it does say "we do not insist on any radical measure at present," but for a beginning paragraph 10 in the bill he hopes to see adopted is radical enough. It is as follows:

"When applied to in writing by the Mayor of any city or the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of any town in this State, it shall be the duty of said Commissioners, or any two of them, to investigate the conduct or fitness of any agent, conductor or engineer in the service of any company operating a railroad, or any part thereof, within this State, and their report concerning same, when transmitted to the General Manager or Superintendent of said company, may be sufficient grounds for the removal or discharge of such agent, conductor or engineer. Said Commissioners shall not be held to account in court or elsewhere for anything with respect to those who may be contained in their said report."

In order to understand this section we must read what the Commissioners say about it. Turning to page 35 we find it most elaborately discussed. The Commissioners begin by stating that Mr. HUNTINGTON, Mr. GOULD and Mr. SCOTT, having invested largely in Kentucky, are absolute masters of our railroad system, and, being aliens or outsiders, ought to be restricted in the control of their employees. The Commissioners say:

"The corporations often, no doubt, place men in positions of trust and power, because they are the favorites or relatives of those having authority in the company. In the majority of instances they are most probably suitable persons for their respective positions, but we have frequent complaints with reference to employees who can defy public sentiment, and with perfect impunity make themselves obnoxious to those with whom they come in contact in the discharge of duty. These complaints are not infrequently made during good behavior, but at the will of the one man who in each case controls the corporation."

Still further they say:

"We are impressed with the belief that here is an appropriate place for civil-service reform. Let the companies have full power to select their employees, but if they refuse to go into it at all, but seek around the corner and pick the pockets of those who do. How can any honest man fail to agree with them?"

The *Chicago Tribune*, and several other papers of less note, say that the McPherson Bill proposes to permit the national banks to increase their note issues 10 per cent. without increasing their investment in bonds. This is not quite correct. It increases the limit of circulation 11.9 per cent. On \$100,000 of bonds there could be issued under the present law \$90,000 in notes, but under the McPherson Bill \$100,000 in notes. The difference, \$10,000, is 11.9 per cent. of the present limit.

A SHORT time since the Tennessee protection papers made much ado over a purported interview with Hon. CASEY YOUNG, the Congressman from the Memphis district, in which he was quoted as taking grounds against tariff agitation. Mr. YOUNG now writes a letter, in which he says he will not yet with the Democrats on this subject and will support the Morrison Bill. This is more than the Tennessee protection papers have said.

Will those who are upholding protection because they allege it gives good wages to the workmen explain why the reductions in wages have all been in the protected industries, while the wages of skilled workmen in the unprotected industries, such as carpenters, blacksmiths, bricklayers, etc., have not been affected?

The names of the principal delegates to the Louisiana Republican Convention held the glorious "days that are gone" when that patriotic crowd had the State in a sling. All that is needed to round out these pathetic memories are the names of JIM ANDERSON and LAZARUS PINKSTON.

CONGRESSMAN WISE says he will not fight a duel with PAGE MCCARTY or anybody else, although formerly he was a duelist. It is certainly too much to ask that Congressman WISE's allusion to his kitchen should not only send him out of politics, but send him out of the world.

"CINCINNATI claims to be the Madrid of America. Let's see; Madrid is the place where men run around shaking red rags and being gored for the amusement of the populace."—*Chicago News*.

Well, that doesn't matter. The red rag which the Cincinnati shako is none the less a rag because it is called a shirt.

The Toronto editor, Mr. BUNTING—end a gentleman of that name ought to be an authority on the subject—denies that he called the star-spangled banner "a d-d rag." Somebody has probably been confusing Mr. BUNTING with Mr. BISMARCK.

The people of Dakota are seriously considering the *Courier-Journal's* suggestion that they change the name of their capital. Even Cincinnati or Hottotown would be infinitely preferable to Bismarck.

The New York *World* has an article headed "Gen. BUTLER on Dynamite." That is just where the baked-bean aristocracy has been trying to put their Nunky BENJAMIN these many years.

It is said that in England the Queen's book, after the first few days' sales, finds scarcely any market. BROWN's memoirs are evidently on their last legs.

It is reported that Editor DANA is about to start on a trip to Mexico. He intends probably to scour the continent in search of more booms to boom.

It is said that BISMARCK is sorry he "done it." BISMARCK has probably heard that BELFORD is going to speak on the Lasker resolutions.

The Ku-Klux decision of the Supreme Court comes in very appropriately, in view of the recent outbreak of these gentry in Ohio.

Even the war like HALSTEAD has become panic-stricken at the terrific carnival of crime in Ohio and has fled the State.

It has doubtless dawned on Congressman WISE that his kitchen cooked his political goose.

It is thought that Ohio will oppose free hemp as violently as she objects to free wool.

GREAT AND SMALL.

Short Sermon on Long Texts and the Silent Teachers by Type—Notes on the New Books.

THE QUEEN.

Her Book.—During Charles Dickens' first visit to the United States the thing that seemed to amuse him most was the habit of the landlords, in speaking of any prominent person, to say of him: "The most remarkable man in the world, sir." It is only in fear of like offense that we refrain from quoting the words of a fellow-traveler in Scotland, who, in his loving praise of the Queen, said: "She's the most wonderful woman in the kingdom, by George!" Enthusiastic praise is catching, and one who has lived in an atmosphere of such love and adoration as cultured Englishmen and women feel for this great woman is apt to share a little of it. Was it not Louis the Fourteenth who thought more of his title of "First Gentleman in Europe" than of the royal lineage in his diadem and the subject of this sketch is undoubtedly, both by reason of her solitary place upon the throne and by the extent of her domain, entitled to be called "The First Lady in the World."

There would be no social or political gathering possible on the globe which included her presence and denied her this station. Having lived in beautiful Kent among the scenes of her girlhood, and often conversed with those who have known her in private life, as did Dr. Norman MacLeod, her chaplain, from the time when, as the girl Queen, she tremblingly asked the aged parson who told her of her accession to kneel and pray for her, up to the day when, as the aged parson, he told her of her accession to kneel and pray for her, she has been a part of the world's chance to live in quiet and grow in grace and civilization.

The best way seems to be to build a Chinese wall around the whole State, the higher the better, and if possible cover it over and seal it up, thus leaving the Ohioans to reveal among themselves in their wickedness and giving the rest of the world a chance to live in quiet and grow in grace and civilization.

The New York *Tribune* says of the News Copyright Bill:

"On a more careful examination the *World* concludes that, in its present shape, the News Copyright Bill is a just and necessary measure. This we believe, because the 'voice of the responsible papers of New York practically unanimous in its favor. The same thing may be said of the chief papers in every important city of the continent. Wherever money and talent are liberally employed in collecting the news for the benefit of the public, there is to be heard a demand that the results of this enterprise shall not be flooded under the very eyes of the owners, and turned to the advantage of sheets which make no expenditures for the benefit of the public, and count on sustaining life solely by thefts from those who do. Of all silly cries about 'monopoly,' the silliest is that which objects to this bill as creating a 'monopoly in news.' The field for collecting news is as free as air. When a man goes to go into a field, he is not to be told that he is not to go into it at all, but seek around the corner and pick the pockets of those who do. How can any honest man fail to agree with them?"

The *Chicago Tribune*, and several other papers of less note, say that the McPherson Bill proposes to permit the national banks to increase their note issues 10 per cent. without increasing their investment in bonds. This is not quite correct. It increases the limit of circulation 11.9 per cent. On \$100,000 of bonds there could be issued under the present law \$90,000 in notes, but under the McPherson Bill \$100,000 in notes. The difference, \$10,000, is 11.9 per cent. of the present limit.

A SHORT time since the Tennessee protection papers made much ado over a purported interview with Hon. CASEY YOUNG, the Congressman from the Memphis district, in which he was quoted as taking grounds against tariff agitation. Mr. YOUNG now writes a letter, in which he says he will not yet with the Democrats on this subject and will support the Morrison Bill. This is more than the Tennessee protection papers have said.

Will those who are upholding protection because they allege it gives good wages to the workmen explain why the reductions in wages have all been in the protected industries, while the wages of skilled workmen in the unprotected industries, such as carpenters, blacksmiths, bricklayers, etc., have not been affected?

The names of the principal delegates to the Louisiana Republican Convention held the glorious "days that are gone" when that patriotic crowd had the State in a sling. All that is needed to round out these pathetic memories are the names of JIM ANDERSON and LAZARUS PINKSTON.

CONGRESSMAN WISE says he will not fight a duel with PAGE MCCARTY or anybody else, although formerly he was a duelist. It is certainly too much to ask that Congressman WISE's allusion to his kitchen should not only send him out of politics, but send him out of the world.

"CINCINNATI claims to be the Madrid of America. Let's see; Madrid is the place where men run around shaking red rags and being gored for the amusement of the populace."—*Chicago News*.

Well, that doesn't matter. The red rag which the Cincinnati shako is none the less a rag because it is called a shirt.

The Toronto editor, Mr. BUNTING—end a gentleman of that name ought to be an authority on the subject—denies that he called the star-spangled banner "a d-d rag." Somebody has probably been confusing Mr. BUNTING with Mr. BISMARCK.

The people of Dakota are seriously considering the *Courier-Journal's* suggestion that they change the name of their capital. Even Cincinnati or Hottotown would be infinitely preferable to Bismarck.

The New York *World* has an article headed "Gen. BUTLER on Dynamite." That is just where the baked-bean aristocracy has been trying to put their Nunky BENJAMIN these many years.

It is said that in England the Queen's book, after the first few days' sales, finds scarcely any market. BROWN's memoirs are evidently on their last legs.

It is reported that Editor DANA is about to start on a trip to Mexico. He intends probably to scour the continent in search of more booms to boom.

It is said that BISMARCK is sorry he "done it." BISMARCK has probably heard that BELFORD is going to speak on the Lasker resolutions.

The Ku-Klux decision of the Supreme Court comes in very appropriately, in view of the recent outbreak of these gentry in Ohio.

Even the war like HALSTEAD has become panic-stricken at the terrific carnival of crime in Ohio and has fled the State.

It has doubtless dawned on Congressman WISE that his kitchen cooked his political goose.

It is thought that Ohio will oppose free hemp as violently as she objects to free wool.

GREAT AND SMALL.

Short Sermon on Long Texts and the Silent Teachers by Type—Notes on the New Books.

THE QUEEN.

Her Book.—During Charles Dickens' first visit to the United States the thing that seemed to amuse him most was the habit of the landlords, in speaking of any prominent person, to say of him: "The most remarkable man in the world, sir." It is only in fear of like offense that we refrain from quoting the words of a fellow-traveler in Scotland, who, in his loving praise of the Queen, said: "She's the most wonderful woman in the kingdom, by George!" Enthusiastic praise is catching, and one who has lived in an atmosphere of such love and adoration as cultured Englishmen and women feel for this great woman is apt to share a little of it. Was it not Louis the Fourteenth who thought more of his title of "First Gentleman in Europe" than of the royal lineage in his diadem and the subject of this sketch is undoubtedly, both by reason of her solitary place upon the throne and by the extent of her domain, entitled to be called "The First Lady in the World."

There would be no social or political gathering possible on the globe which included her presence and denied her this station. Having lived in beautiful Kent among the scenes of her girlhood, and often conversed with those who have known her in private life, as did Dr. Norman MacLeod, her chaplain, from the time when, as the girl Queen, she tremblingly asked the aged parson who told her of her accession to kneel and pray for her, up to the day when, as the aged parson, he told her of her accession to kneel and pray for her, she has been a part of the world's chance to live in quiet and grow in grace and civilization.

The best way seems to be to build a Chinese wall around the whole State, the higher the better, and if possible cover it over and seal it up, thus leaving the Ohioans to reveal among themselves in their wickedness and giving the rest of the world a chance to live in quiet and grow in grace and civilization.

The New York *Tribune* says of the News Copyright Bill:

"On a more careful examination the *World* concludes that, in its present shape, the News Copyright Bill is a just and necessary measure. This we believe, because the 'voice of the responsible papers of New York practically unanimous in its favor. The same thing may be said of the chief papers in every important city of the continent. Wherever money and talent are liberally employed in collecting the news for the benefit of the public, there is to be heard a demand that the results of this enterprise shall not be flooded under the very eyes of the owners, and turned to the advantage of sheets which make no expenditures for the benefit of the public, and count on sustaining life solely by thefts from those who do. Of all silly cries about 'monopoly,' the silliest is that which objects to this bill as creating a 'monopoly in news.' The field for collecting news is as free as air. When a man goes to go into a field, he is not to be told that he is not to go into it at all, but seek around the corner and pick the pockets of those who do. How can any honest man fail to agree with them?"

The *Chicago Tribune*, and several other papers of less note, say that the McPherson Bill proposes to permit the national banks to increase their note issues 10 per cent. without increasing their investment in bonds. This is not quite correct. It increases the limit of circulation 11.9 per cent. On \$100,000 of bonds there could be issued under the present law \$90,000 in notes, but under the McPherson Bill \$100,000 in notes. The difference, \$10,000, is 11.9 per cent. of the present limit.

A SHORT time since the Tennessee protection papers made much ado over a purported interview with Hon. CASEY YOUNG, the Congressman from the Memphis district, in which he was quoted as taking grounds against tariff agitation. Mr. YOUNG now writes a letter, in which he says he will not yet with the Democrats on this subject and will support the Morrison Bill. This is more than the Tennessee protection papers have said.

Will those who are upholding protection because they allege it gives good wages to the workmen explain why the reductions in wages have all been in the protected industries, while the wages of skilled workmen in the unprotected industries, such as carpenters, blacksmiths, bricklayers, etc., have not been affected?

The names of the principal delegates to the Louisiana Republican Convention held the glorious "days that are gone" when that patriotic crowd had the State in a sling. All that is needed to round out these pathetic memories are the names of JIM ANDERSON and LAZARUS PINKSTON.

CONGRESSMAN WISE says he will not fight a duel with PAGE MCCARTY or anybody else, although formerly he was a duelist. It is certainly too much to ask that Congressman WISE's allusion to his kitchen should not only send him out of politics, but send him out of the world.

"CINCINNATI claims to be the Madrid of America. Let's see; Madrid is the place where men run around shaking red rags and being gored for the amusement of the populace."—*Chicago News*.

Well, that doesn't matter. The red rag which the Cincinnati shako is none the less a rag because it is called a shirt.

The Toronto editor, Mr. BUNTING—end a gentleman of that name ought to be an authority on the subject—denies that he called the star-spangled banner "a d-d rag." Somebody has probably been confusing Mr. BUNTING with Mr. BISMARCK.

The people of Dakota are seriously considering the *Courier-Journal's* suggestion that they change the name of their capital. Even Cincinnati or Hottotown would be infinitely preferable to Bismarck.

The New York *World* has an article headed "Gen. BUTLER on Dynamite." That is just where the baked-bean aristocracy has been trying to put their Nunky BENJAMIN these many years.

It is said that in England the Queen's book, after the first few days' sales, finds scarcely any market. BROWN's memoirs are evidently on their last legs.

It is reported that Editor DANA is about to start on a trip to Mexico. He intends probably to scour the continent in search of more booms to boom.

It is said that BISMARCK is sorry he "done it." BISMARCK has probably heard that BELFORD is going to speak on the Lasker resolutions.

The Ku-Klux decision of the Supreme Court comes in very appropriately, in view of the recent outbreak of these gentry in Ohio.

Even the war like HALSTEAD has become panic-stricken at the terrific carnival of crime in Ohio and has fled the State.

It has doubtless dawned on Congressman WISE that his kitchen cooked his political goose.

It is thought that Ohio will oppose free hemp as violently as she objects to free wool.

GREAT AND SMALL.

Short Sermon on Long Texts and the Silent Teachers by Type—Notes on the New Books.

THE QUEEN.

Her Book.—During Charles Dickens' first visit to the United States the thing that seemed to amuse him most was the habit of the landlords, in speaking of any prominent person, to say of him: "The most remarkable man in the world, sir." It is only in fear of like offense that we refrain from quoting the words of a fellow-traveler in Scotland, who, in his loving praise of the Queen, said: "She's the most wonderful woman in the kingdom, by George!" Enthusiastic praise is catching, and one who has lived in an atmosphere of such love and adoration as cultured Englishmen and women feel for this great woman is apt to share a little of it. Was it not Louis the Fourteenth who thought more of his title of "First Gentleman in Europe" than of the royal lineage in his diadem and the subject of this sketch is undoubtedly, both by reason of her solitary place upon the throne and by the extent of her domain, entitled to be called "The First Lady in the World."

There would be no social or political gathering possible on the globe which included her presence and denied her this station. Having lived in beautiful Kent among the scenes of her girlhood, and often conversed with those who have known her in private life, as did Dr. Norman MacLeod, her chaplain, from the time when, as the girl Queen, she tremblingly asked the aged parson who told her of her accession to kneel and pray for her, up to the day when, as the aged parson, he told her of her accession to kneel and pray for her, she has been a part of the world's chance to live in quiet and grow in grace and civilization.

The best way seems to be to build a Chinese wall around the whole State, the higher the better, and if possible cover it over and seal it up, thus leaving the Ohioans to reveal among themselves in their wickedness and giving the rest of the world a chance to live in quiet and grow in grace and civilization.

The New York *Tribune* says of the News Copyright Bill:

"On a more careful examination the *World* concludes that, in its present shape, the News Copyright Bill is a just and necessary measure. This we believe, because the 'voice of the responsible papers of New York practically unanimous in its favor. The same thing may be said of the chief papers in every important city of the continent. Wherever money and talent are liberally employed in collecting the news for the benefit of the public, there is to be heard a demand that the results of this enterprise shall not be flooded under the very eyes of the owners, and turned to the advantage of sheets which make no expenditures for the benefit of the public, and count on sustaining life solely by thefts from those who do. Of all silly cries about 'monopoly,' the silliest is that which objects to this bill as creating a 'monopoly in news.' The field for collecting news is as free as air. When a man goes to go into a field, he is not to be told that he is not to go into it at all, but seek around the corner and pick the pockets of those who do. How can any honest man fail to agree with them?"

The *Chicago Tribune*, and several other papers of less note, say that the McPherson Bill proposes to permit the national banks to increase their note issues 10 per cent. without increasing their investment in bonds. This is not quite correct. It increases the limit of circulation 11.9 per cent. On \$100,000 of bonds there could be issued under the present law \$90,000 in notes, but under the McPherson Bill \$100,000 in notes. The difference, \$10,000, is 11.9 per cent. of the present limit.

A SHORT time since the Tennessee protection papers made much ado over a purported interview with Hon. CASEY YOUNG, the Congressman from the Memphis district, in which he was quoted as taking grounds against tariff agitation. Mr. YOUNG now writes a letter, in which he says he will not yet with the Democrats on this subject and will support the Morrison Bill. This is more than the Tennessee protection papers have said.

Will those who are upholding protection because they allege it gives good wages to the workmen explain why the reductions in wages have all been in the protected industries, while the wages of skilled workmen in the unprotected industries, such as carpenters, blacksmiths, bricklayers, etc

ard Scott Publishing Company, 43 Park Row, New York, \$4 50 a year; 40 cents a copy.

—*Examination Manuals, No. 1: Arithmetic.*—The manual has two parts, the first having 150 examination papers, divided into three groups. It is the best series of "hour papers" we have seen, invaluable to teachers and principals. (Ginn, H. Co., Boston; John P. Morton & Co., Louisville, Ky.)

—*Carpenter and His Treatment.*—This is the book for every-day people, by Dr. Wilhelm Eistein, popularized by Emil W. Roemer, M. D., and telling how to treat excessive flesh as a disease. (Brentano Brothers, publishers, New York and Washington.)

—*Christianity Triumphant.*—This is the last volume of the "Standard Library," and is the story of aggressive and defensive religion in its modern shape, by John P. Newman, D. D., LL. D. (Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Day street, New York.)

—*The Contemporary Review.*—"Pottery, Old and New," and the "Housing of the London Poor," are the two best articles for American study. (Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 23 Park Row, New York, \$4 50 a year; 40 cents a copy.)

—*The Kingdom.*—By Frederick Gregory Forsyth, member of the Virginia Historical Society, dedicated to the Comte de Paris and the Marquis de Lafayette. (Charlottesville Chronicle Steam Press, 20 cents. Monarchial.)

—*The Hygiene Cook-Book; or* healthful and palatable food without condiments.—This is a valuable treatise by R. T. Trall, M. D., and is the fifth edition. (Fowler & Wells, publishers, 752 Broadway, New York.)

—*The Air We Breathe and Ventilation.*—by Henry A. Mott, Th. D., etc.—This is number two of the Most Sanitary Series, and is quite valuable. (John Wiley & Sons, 15 Astor Place, New York.)

—*A Circuit of the Continent.*—This is Henry Ward Beecher's lecture on his travels in America, with characteristic opinions. (Fords, Howard & Hurlbert, 27 Park Place, New York, 10 cents.)

—*The Book-buyer.*—A summary of American and foreign literature. (Annual subscription 50 cents; single number, 5 cents. J. G. Putnam's Sons, New York.)

—*The Southern Bivouac.*—See this excellent number. (Corner of Green and Center streets, Louisville, Ky.; \$1 50 a year; 15 cents a copy.)

—*The Cincinnati representatives of D. Appleton & Co.* have sent us some of the books in this list.

A WHOLE NEST OF THEM.

A House Full of Negroes Arrested for Robbery and Arson—The Rowsey Case Being Argued.

(Special to the Courier-Journal.)
DANVILLE, Ky., March 6.—A vagabondish old negro named Tom Hansford, his wife Hannah, his daughter Mary and his son William, both of whom are nearly grown, another colored son named James Barkley and his wife Anna, and still another colored individual named Richard Bentley, were arrested this morning for robbing Potts, Proctor & Co.'s mill, near the depot, and setting fire to the same. The accused parties all live in the same house, which is situated not far from the mill, on the Lebanon pike. They were detected by the officers following up a trail of spilled flour from the mill to the house, where about one thousand pounds of flour was found. A lot of copper pipe, also stolen, was recovered. The fire was started in the engine-room, and had burned through a wooden partition and was licking the ceiling when discovered and extinguished.

Wm. Hansford, James Barkley and Richard Bentley have confessed; the others still keep up a weak denial. Tom is a rather shrewd old sinner for his looks, and has told some persons that his last name is Hansel, that being the name of the family in Fayette county to whom he formerly belonged. The day he told the Sheriff that he formerly belonged to the Hansfords, of Lincoln county. The arrested persons are in jail, and Judge Owsley, of the Circuit Court, has had a special grand jury summoned for to-morrow to inquire into their case, the regular grand jury for this term having been discharged.

The testimony of witnesses in the case of George W. Rowsey, charged with killing his cousin and brother-in-law, Jasper S. Green, a few days ago, was concluded this evening, and the opening argument made for the defense by Hon. J. M. Durham. The case will be further argued in the morning by T. H. Jacobs for the defense and Messrs. Robert Harding and R. C. Warren for the prosecution, and then submitted to the jury.

ENDED AT LAST.

The long-contested suits involving the Ball Estate settled in the Court of Appeals—Other News From Frankfort.

FRANKFORT, March 6.—The long-contested suits between the children and grandchildren of Dr. John Ball, deceased, of Louisville, reached their final decision in the Court of Appeals to-day, Judge Fryor delivering the opinions. They involve a large sum of money and the power of the trustee, Wm. Cronin, to pay out that money under the provisions of the will, which has been defined by the Appellate Court as affirming the opinions of the Superior Court lately made in the same cases in favor of the trustee.

The cases are styled Cronin, trustee, vs. Ball, &c.; Ball, &c., vs. Cronin, trustee, &c., and Snively, guardian, &c., vs. Cronin, trustee, &c.—all on an appeal from the Louisville Chancery Court to the Superior Court, and thence to the Court of Appeals, the first-named suit being reversed and the last affirmed.

Col. John F. Hagar, of Ashland, has suggested a novel and effective way of raising money for the school fund and preventing the honorable titles preferred by the Governor from sinking into such disrepute which the press and people have made the subject of late days. He says there ought to be a certain number of Generals' commissions, a certain number of Colonels', Majors' and Captains' commissions sold at auction to the highest bidder, and the money converted to the use of the public schools. He thinks that as nearly every Kentucky citizen has a military title, it would create an exciting and healthy interest in the schools, a large sum of money being brought to the schools, and the Government's term of office.

Miss Lavinia Evans and her company will appear at the Opera-house to-morrow night in "Peggy's Ferry." She will then go to Lexington and return here next Monday night and perform at "Devondale."

J. Hawthorne Hill, of Louisville, is here to-day.

Col. W. H. Bailey, Marshal Louisville Chancery Court, is in the city.

Want Ninety Days' Time.

SAN FRANCISCO, March 6.—At a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce this afternoon, resolutions were adopted protesting against the proposed action of the Government to confiscate all duty-paid merchandise over three years in the event of a default in the payment of the Treasury requesting a delay of 90 days.

Bought Out by a Syndicate.
BOSTON, March 6.—The Hayden Company, manufacturers of brass goods at Haverhill, Mass., have been bought out by a syndicate of Western gentlemen, understood to represent a combination formed to control the brass market.

A POOR CASE

Made Out By Keifer in His Efforts to Prove the Charges Made Against Boynton.

The Ex-Speaker's Own Weapons Made to Turn Their Fire to His Disadvantage.

The Evidence in Defense of Boynton All in, and He is Apparently Victorious.

Cases Parallel to the Keifer-Boynton Imbroglio Cited By Miss Grundy.

SOME INTERESTING READING.

WASHINGTON, March 6.—In the Keifer-Boynton investigation to-day, John A. Sloan, of Washington, testified to the general bad reputation of J. W. Elder, of this city. He would not believe him under oath.

Representative Jordan, of the Second Congressional district of Ohio, testified to the good reputation of Gen. Boynton.

Edgar M. Johnson, a lawyer of Cincinnati, called in answer to a question as to Boynton's reputation for integrity and honor, said with emphasis that it was especially good.

Gen. Rosecrans had known Gen. Boynton for 20 years and had never heard his integrity impeached in the slightest degree until he heard Gen. Keifer's speech on the floor of the House.

Mr. Ramsey offered in evidence a transcript of the record of the Court of General Sessions, New York, showing the arrest of Boynton in the Tomb of J. W. Elder for obtaining money by personating W. G. Elder, a New York detective.

Gen. Keifer was placed upon the stand and examined by Mr. Ramsey.

"At whose solicitation did you, Gen. Keifer, write a letter to the Department of Justice in behalf of Elder?" asked Mr. Ramsey.

"I do not remember at whose solicitation," replied Gen. Keifer.

Mr. Ramsey asked if the witness had not paid Elder's board-bill at the United States Hotel.

"No," replied the witness.

"Did you advance any money for this purpose?" asked the counsel.

The reply was again in the negative, the answer being qualified to a denial of any direct knowledge of the board bill. On being further questioned, the witness testified that he had received \$60 or \$70 to his account, to be used for the benefit of Elder. He had heard that Elder was sick, and this money went to pay his board.

"Elder was not ill at that time, was he?" asked Ramsey.

The witness said he knew nothing about that, or something to that effect.

Representative Follett, of the First Congressional district of Ohio, Senator Hawley, Connecticut, Representative Hitt, and others testified strongly in support of Gen. Boynton's good character.

Mr. Ramsey again offered in evidence that portion of the testimony taken by the Kellogg-Stafford Committee, which contains the cross-examination of Elder. His purpose, he explained, was to show the improbability of Boynton's long conversation with Elder, as it was alleged he had with Elder, with such a man as this testimony proved Elder to be.

The committee declined to receive the evidence.

To the next witness, E. J. Works, of New York, it was a mystery why he had been summoned here. He knew nothing about the case, and he had been summoned by Keifer, but called to the stand by Boynton.

Charles L. Garfield was recalled, and cross-examined by Ramsey, and after cross-examination the witness testified that he was arrested in DeKalb county, Ind., in 1879 or 1880. He was indicted for burglary. To Coleman he said the case was made possible, and he was innocent of the charges.

Z. B. Belding, proprietor of the United States Hotel, was next placed upon the stand, and he testified that he had known Elder for some time, and the witness held a bond as collateral. He said that Elder owed him a board bill of over \$100, and that a few days ago he had paid it to him.

The clerk \$70 in payment of Elder's board and left immediately without waiting for a receipt. He would not know if he had received it or not.

He acknowledged that he expected some one to come there to pay the bill. He could not say whether or not Elder had told him that Keifer would settle the bill, but he thought Keifer's name was mentioned in that connection. Elder had said something about expecting money for witness fees.

Coleman then went voluntarily on the stand and made a statement in regard to the payment of money to Elder. He said when preparing the case he was asked to pay Elder to Cleveland to see Garfield. He paid Elder \$50 to pay his expenses, but when he returned he told him (Coleman) he had paid over more than \$50 in expenses, and that his landlord was very pressing. Elder said \$70 would be enough, and Coleman had sent the sum to the clerk of the United States Hotel.

Mr. Prescott, a messenger in the Senate, knew Elder. His reputation for truth and veracity was good at all.

Brawley Cameron, general agent of the Department of Justice, was called. He produced and read a letter from the files of the Department. The letter was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S. WASHINGTON, D. C., March 6, 1884.
Hon. Attorney General, Sir:—I am well acquainted with John W. Elder, who will be a witness in the case of Keifer vs. Boynton, and he is reliable in all respects. I ask of you as a personal favor to give him a hearing on the case of Keifer vs. Boynton, and I assure you he does not wish to impose on you in any way. Yours with high esteem, Wm. Cronin.

Ramsey said he wanted to prove by this witness that the matter which Elder General wanted was money, and that he was not a witness to the purpose of operating against the Government and in the interest of those implicated in the fraud.

The Chairman of the committee decided that this testimony would be better suited for Springer's committee, and ruled it out.

Cameron said the Department was under no obligation to him. I wish to say for him that he is a stranger to the proceedings of this House, and there being a title in the Ohio, he had no right to be here.

He was called in, and upon his knees repudiated accordingly, and then discharged.

In connection with political morality I have lately read something of the kind in a long ago New York politics began to be corrupt, and how intimidation was practiced at elections in that State over 60 years ago. The incident is also of interest in connection with the CHAMBERS-MANNING TEST.

The contest between ex-Representatives Chambers and Manning for the position of National House of Representatives, the latter in claiming his election having alleged that the name of the ballots, Chambers' name was spelled, Chambers, and that he had been sworn to the latter's claim to a seat in the last Congress on account of marks having appeared on some of the ballots of his opponent. It was argued on his behalf that the marks on ballots were illegals, although from the fact it was known that the marks on these Mississippi ballots were those of the

printer, and therefore the technical objection was not valid.

The old proverb, that there is nothing new under the sun, was never better illustrated than by the fact that a somewhat similar case occurred in the National House of Representatives in 1824. The following account of the case appears in the *National Intelligencer* for January 8, 1824:

The late House of Representatives on the contest of election from the Twenty-ninth district of the State of New York turned, in effect, upon the question of whether a printed ballot having the stroke of a pen drawn through it should or should not be admitted as a valid vote. The returns of the inspectors of the election it was admitted, on all hands, that the two candidates came within a single vote of having an equal number. The same returns, or rather the certificates accompanying them, stated that one of the voters named Wilson was of the description mentioned; the printed letters were distinctly legible, but a dash with a pen was drawn across the whole name. On this account the inspectors rejected the vote, and it was not counted. The omission of this ballot, after the decision on each of the grounds, gave Mr. Adams a majority of one. The advocates of Mr. Wilson contended that, as the ballot contained neither name nor number, it was presumed that the elector would give in a blank ballot, and that the vote ought to be counted as such, and the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

On the other hand, it was insisted that the inspectors of the election were not to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

The advocates of Mr. Wilson, however, denied that the inspectors of the election were to be considered as judges of the genuineness or fraudulence of the ballot, but that they had decided upon this ballot from other inspection, namely, under oath and with entire unanimity, that the name of the elector was not legible, and that the vote counted for it was possible that the voter might have been an old man and did not see the line drawn across his name, or a simple man who, intending to vote for Mr. Wilson, had been cheated out of his vote by having his otherwise valid ballot rejected by an advocate of the opposite candidate.

ON 'CHANGE.

The Stock Market Has a Dull Day in Wall Street, With But Slight Fluctuations.

The Stagnation Charged to the Room Traders, Who by Common Consent Refused to Trade.

Vanderbilt Thought To Be Prepared to Demand Representation in the Board of Directors of St. Paul.

At Chicago the Local Trading Is Improved and Prices Take a Downward Turn.

AN IMPROVEMENT EXPECTED.

(Special to the Courier-Journal.)

New York, March 6.—The stock market was dull all day. Fluctuations did not reach one per cent. Many active stocks, and at the close prices were about the same as last night. This stagnant condition was brought about by the room traders, who, by common consent, refused to trade. All the smaller shorts have covered, and the bears who refuse to do so are ready to see the market a good deal higher before they will sell. Many of the time speculators and several leading operators are very bullish, especially on Union Pacific, St. Paul, Northwest, Lackawanna and Reading.

where the injury could not be avoided; but if it be conceded that the proof in this case was sufficient to authorize the court to

Visit the City Hall and Witness the Maneuvers of the Fire Department, and Go On 'Change.

A VISIT TO THE LIFE-SAVERS

Yesterday morning the Lexingtonians were conducted to the City Hall, where they received an official greeting from Mayor Jacob, assisted by other officials. After inspecting the city building, Chief Hughes of

and 5 directed streams of water at an imaginary fire at the top of the flag-staff, and gave a thrilling exhibition of the power of

engine threw a stream several feet above the large flag, and the force was further manifested in lowering the flag, during which the stream struck the large gas lamp and relieved it of all its glass.

FURTHER PROCEEDINGS.

At 12.30 o'clock the visitors were escorted to the Board of Trade, where a purely business reception was tendered them. Half an hour was spent in introducing the guests to the merchants on 'Change, after which Major-General Clarke called the meeting to order, and announced that he had to receive the reception of all formality and proceed with the regular business of the day. In order that the guests might witness the transactions on 'Change, The Grain Call Board was opened, and some large blocks of grain were disposed of. Manager Wright took of the working plans of the Board of Trade and explained many of its business details. The guests were then offered by the Lexington Chamber of Commerce might retire.

After an interesting interchange of views on various business topics the meeting adjourned, and the guests were invited to visit the House of Commons at 3 o'clock of Third Street. Capt. Billy Devan received them

rough the different apartments of the
ation. The boat-room, the reception-room,

the bed-room were duly inspected, and the visitors were introduced to the crew, after which a visit was made to the upper deck to witness a cruise of one of the lifeboats over the dam and through the dangerous rapids thereabouts, where duty so often calls them to rescue persons in distress. A boat, manned by three of the crew, darted out from the station under the impetus given by the admirable regularity of the operation, and was soon in the dangerous region. The guests

and was watched with the closest attention by the visitors. As the boat reached the

overcome, and when the plunger forced the water away, the men disappeared from view for a moment, the interest became decidedly intense, and when it reappeared, bounding over the breakers, expressions of admiration for the skill and daring of the crew ran through the crowd. The visitors expressed unbounded pleasure at witnessing the feat on the water, and remained on deck to see the crew return, and to witness the boat over the big dam and pulling over the small one against a heavy current. The regular sailing ship named "The station register" farewells was attended to the life-savers, and the delegation was escorted to the Galt House to dinner. After

...they returned to Lexington, highly
delighted with their visit. Said one of the
visitors: "We expected the formal courtesies

"I am glad to see the merchants of Louisville giving their Lexington visitors such a cordial reception," said a gentleman from Lexington, who was here for the CINCINNATI JOURNAL reporter yesterday. "And I do hope that Louisville merchants will make an effort to secure the same for those from Lexington." "Doesn't Louisville try to sell goods in our section?" asked the reporter.

"No, sir," he replied. "It is why Cincinnati gets the trade. It is a rare thing to see a Louisville drummer in our town; but we have them from Cincinnati every day." "Do you mean that they direct sales to Louisville," suggested the reporter.

"Not a bit of it," he replied. "The rate on freight is the thing. The rate is higher here than from Cincinnati, though the distance is double, and the Louisville roads deliver the goods at a lower rate. The rate here is the rate. No, sir, Louisville merchants can get our trade if they will come after it, and Cincinnati does."

HOMEWARD BOUND.

THE LEXINGTON DELGATION HOLD AN IN-

NESS OF THEIR HEARTS RESOLUTE THANK-
FULLY.

(Special to the Courier-Journal.)
The Chamber of Commerce of Lexington, which has just visited your city to promote fraternal relations, were this evening in their way back, they held a meeting on the train, in which Mr. J. Hull Davidson, of the Chamber of Commerce, made a neat and appropriate speech, complimentary of the city, and N. railroad, and of Mr. W. S. McChesney, Jr., as representative. They passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, By the members of the Chamber of Commerce and City Council of Lexington, composing this committee, that our warmest thanks are due the officers and management of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad for the excellent treatment and courteous favors extended to us on our trip.

Resolved, To consider their handsome attentions as complimentary to Lexington and appreciate them as such, and to extend to them the most mutual support to each other. Further,

That our thanks to Mr. W. S. McChesney, Jr., for his kind and thoughtful consideration of every comfort, but indicate our increased appreciation of his merit as an officer and worth as a man.

That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the management.

That the committee thanked the meeting for its equipment to the road in a well-timed speech. He said the road was obliged to the committee for accepting its hospitalities.

The following resolution, offered by Mr. Lanck, was unanimously adopted:

Whereas, The members of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad have just returned to Louisville on the occasion of its visit to Louisville, overwhelmed us with hospitalities that will be long remembered, they were unbought, therefore be it

Resolved, By the Lexington Chamber of Commerce,

their hospitable treatment will be treasured by
among the most grateful and agreeable of ou

memories. ALEX. PEARSON, Chairman.
 A. C. CAMPBELL, Secretary.

Our people have come back perfectly en-
 thusiastic over the elegant treatment they re-
 ceived at the hands of your city. They
 were gratified by what Mr. Green, of the
 N. and N. railroad, said about Lexington
 saving the capital. They express themselves
 as having thought it would be bad taste to
 mention anything about the capital now,
 they want to promote a perfect affiliation
 between the two cities, and it is hoped by our
 people that your willingness to give us the
 capital will be one of the good outgrowths
 of it.

TRADE MARK

**THE GREAT
 GERMAN REMEDY
 FOR PAIN.**

cures
 Rheumatism, Neuralgia, Sciatica,
 Lumbago, Backache, Headache, Toothache,
 Stomachic, Swelling, Sprains, Bruises,
 Burns, Scalds, Cuts, Ulcers,
 AND ALL OTHER BODILY PAINS AND AFFLICTIONS.
 Sold by Druggists and Dealers everywhere. Price 50 cents per bottle.
 Dispensed in 11 Languages.

THE CHAS. A. VOOGLER CO.
 Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.
 Manufactured by VOOGLER & CO.